



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/718,390

11/20/2003

Ronald F. Palermo

10670013010202

9732

37211 7590 01/02/2009

BASCH & NICKERSON LLP
1777 PENFIELD ROAD
PENFIELD, NY 14526

EXAMINER

WOLLSCHLAGER, JEFFREY MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1791

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/02/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dneels@bnpatentlaw.com
dmasters@bnpatentlaw.com
mnickerson@bnpatentlaw.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/718,390	Applicant(s) PALERMO ET AL.	
	Examiner JEFFREY WOLLSCHLAGER	Art Unit 1791	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeff Wollschlager. (3) ____.

(2) Duane C. Basch. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 23 December 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 20-23.

Identification of prior art discussed: Shaw et al. (US 6,033,146); Harvey (US 6,568,146); Danielsson (US 4,281,496).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative, Mr. Basch, and Ex. Wollschlager discussed the 9/17/08 non-final office action. Mr. Basch proposed an amendment to claims 20 and 22 directed to the grinding step and explained how this proposed amendment distinguishes over the Shaw et al. reference. Ex. Wollschlager suggested Mr. Basch submit the proposed amendment and REMARKS in writing for further consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Jeff Wollschlager/ Examiner, Art Unit 1791	
--	--